1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 TIMOTHY JACKSON SEELEY, 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-04-1800 DFL CMK P 12 VS. TERESA A. SCHWARTZ, et al., 13 14 Defendants. **ORDER** 15 On July 14, 2005, plaintiff filed a letter. The letter was not served on defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is again advised¹ that every document submitted to the court for consideration must be 18 served on defendants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5. Documents not to be served electronically are usually 19 served by placing a copy in the U.S. mail. 20 To comply with the service requirement, plaintiff must file his original document 21 along with a proof of service, stating the date an accurate copy of the document was mailed to 22 defendants and the address to which it was mailed. See Local Rule 5-135(b) and (c). Plaintiff 23 must file a copy of his document only if his original document exceeds twenty-five pages. 24 25

26

¹Plaintiff was cautioned on June 24, 2005 that he was required to properly serve all documents which he submitted to the court for consideration. (Doc. 42.)

Case 2:04-cv-01800-DFL-CMK Document 49 Filed 07/22/05 Page 2 of 2

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's July 14, 2005 letter shall be placed in the court file and disregarded. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to serve any documents subsequently filed in this action properly, and failure to include a proper certificate of service with such filing, may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.

DATED: July 21, 2005.

CRAIG M. KELLISON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE